

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, December 11, 2014 9:26 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: [AIN] Re: Your lede is wrong

(b)(3)

(b)(6)

(b)(3)

CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED

(b)(3)

Mark

Thanks for the update and the revision. I think he was trying to point out that for our officer there were approved techniques and non approved actions. That doesn't mean he defended the approved techniques. He was defending the officers who acted consistent with the authorization and legal guidance.

I think the long back and forth on "unknowable" does indicate he is not arguing that waterboarding worked or was necessary.

So he defended officers acting consistent with the law at the time. He did not defend eits. That is an important distinction.

Thanks

(b)(3)

From: Mazzetti, Mark [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, December 11, 2014 09:08 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Your lede is wrong

(b)(6)

(b)(3)

(b)(6)

Hey [REDACTED] We just closed the story for first edition of the paper, which is substantially different than the web story. It will be posted on web soon.
1. In this version, we do write that Brennan said today that he stood by those 2009 comments. 2. To your other point, the lede has changed for print edition but we do say that Brennan strongly defended the EITs (including water boarding) during the press conference. Even though he said there were negative consequences, he only singled out the "out of bounds" techniques for

(b)(3)

criticism--not the techniques that DOJ authorized.
Best, Mark and Matt

reserved criticism

On Thu, Dec 11, 2014 at 8:30 PM, [REDACTED] > wrote: Brennan did not defend the use of waterboarding. In fact he said he stood by his 2009 comments about the negative consequences of eits. The same ones you cite claiming he changed his position.

(b)(3)

--
National Security Correspondent The New York Times Work: 202-862-0303 [REDACTED]

(b)(6)